



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/752,662	01/06/2004	John Leagh Beadell	IGT1P017D1	4121
22434	7590	12/23/2005	EXAMINER	
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP			NGUYEN, KIM T	
P.O. BOX 70250			ART UNIT	
OAKLAND, CA 94612-0250			PAPER NUMBER	
			3713	
DATE MAILED: 12/23/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

(1)

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/752,662	Applicant(s) BEADELL ET AL.	
	Examiner Kim T. Nguyen	Art Unit 3713	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 October 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-13 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 7 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Examiner acknowledges receipt of the RCE filed on 10/3/05. The amendment on 8/4/05 has been entered. According to the amendment, claims 1-2 and 4-13 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-2, 4-6 and 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada et al (US 6,201,703) in view of Monson (US 5,472,247).

Claims 1, 4-6: Yamada discloses a removable processor enclosure apparatus comprising an enclosure securely containing the CPU electrical components, a door for allowing or preventing to access to the interior space (Fig. 2; col. 1, lines 40-60 and col. 3, lines 65-67); and a lock mechanism (col. 7, lines 41-42). Yamada does not explicitly disclose that the lock mechanism includes a primary lock assembly and an independent operable secondary lock assembly as claimed. However, Monson discloses a lock mechanism including a primary lock assembly (two primary bolts 8 and 10 in Fig. 2) and an independent operable secondary lock assembly that is capable of being selectively movable between an unengaged condition and an engaged condition,

retaining the primary lock assembly in the locked condition and preventing movement thereof to the unlocked condition (col. 3, lines 3-18 and 31-57). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the lock mechanism of Monson to the apparatus of Yamada in order to enhance providing the door with multiple points of resistance.

Claim 2: Yamada discloses coupling the door to the enclosure by hinges (col. 3, lines 59-61).

Claims 10-13: Yamada discloses including an external connector device (Fig. 2; col. 5, lines 15-23). Further, using specific type of connector for coupling an electrical components such as USB connectors, Ethernet connectors, serial port connectors or parallel connectors; and coupling a CD-ROM drive, DVD ROM drive, hard disk drive, etc. to an electrical components such as a CPU would have been well known to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

3. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada et al (US 6,201,703) in view of Klan et al (US 5,531,309).

Yamada et al. disclose the security door but lacks in a sensor to sound an alarm. In an analogous disclosing gaming Klan et al. teaches a door switch, which is a sensor, that is connected to an alarm means, see figure 1. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to apply the teachings of Klan et al. into the gaming machine of Yamada et al; in order to notify security if the front door of the gaming machine was open.

4. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada et al (US 6,201,703) in view of Nye (US 2,609,268).

Yamada et al. discloses the security door but lacks disclosing a release latch to facilitate removal of the electronic components within. In an analogous device, Nye teaches providing a release latch in order to provide a mechanical advantage to facilitate removal of the components within the gaming machine. Therefore, one skilled in the art would find it obvious to incorporate Nye's teachings into Yamada et al. for the reasoning found within Nye which is stated herein.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claim 7 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The prior art of record fails to show or fairly suggests a removable processor enclosure apparatus as set forth in claim 7 in combination with claims 1 and 4-6.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 8/4/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument in page 7, first and second paragraphs, Monson discloses a secondary lock assembly that is independently operable of the primary lock assembly (turning or operating the handle or a key to rotate the pin (the

Art Unit: 3713

secondary lock assembly, the pin (secondary lock assembly) is operable separately from the primary block assembly (col. 3, lines 37-46). Further, the claim language “an independent operable secondary lock assembly” does not explicitly highlight the feature “separating the operation of the secondary lock assembly from that of the primary lock assembly” as asserted by the applicant. The claim language does not specifically claim a specific structure of the lock assemblies to highlight how the secondary lock assembly is independently operable and to highlight the difference between the independently operable secondary lock assembly of the present application and the secondary lock assembly taught by Monson.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kim Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-4441. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday during business hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Xuan Thai, can be reached on 571-272-7147. The central official fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

kn
Date: December 21, 2005



Kim Nguyen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3713